

REMARKS

Applicant has now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of August 3, 2005. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-11 were rejected. Claims 1-2 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonkin (U. S. Publication 2005/0015392 A1) in view of Allen (U. S. Patent 5,428694). Claims 3-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonkin (U. S. Publication 2005/0015392 A1) and Allen (U. S. Patent 5,428694) in view of Yankovich (U.S. Patent 6,704,906).

Applicants have amended the claims to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Claim 1 has been amended, new claims 36 and 37 have been added, and claims 1 – 11, 36 and 37 are now pending.

Amended Claim 1 is patentable distinguishable over Tonkin in view of Allen

Claim 1 has been amended in order to further clarify the invention. The method of Claim 1 now includes the added limitation of identifying a document component node for each operation in the document, retrieving the capabilities and constraints of the printers and finishers and mapping all generic document forms that result in the creation of the finished document. Neither Tokin nor Allen disclose these steps. The system in Tokin involves "determining whether it is physically possible to create the document according to the document information." (Page 2, Paragraph 13) Tokin does not disclose mapping all generic document forms that are possible and then selecting one form from the finite set of possible forms. Tokin simply tests to see if the form that the user entered is possible in the current system. Allen uses a similar process where a stand alone finishing machine is configured to finish the document in accordance with machine produced instructions. Allen makes no reference to employing multiple finishing machines in order to map all possible conforming document forms. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is currently in condition for allowance. Furthermore, because all remaining claims depend upon claim 1, it is further submitted that the remaining claims (claims 2-11, 36 and 37) are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-11, 36 and 37) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Patrick R. Roche, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

2/3/06
Date

Patrick R. Roche
Patrick R. Roche
Reg. No. 29,580
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582